

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached replacement sheet of drawings 3/3 includes changes to Fig. 6. In Fig. 6, on branch 5 below device 1, reference numeral 34 has been replaced with reference numeral 31, which properly corresponds to the pressure sensor element positioned on branch 5.

Attachments: Replacement Sheet 3/3 (Fig. 6)

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action dated May 16, 2008, the Examiner objected to the drawings for failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4); objected to the specification based on informalities; rejected claims 1, 5-8, 10, 11, 14, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,806,135 to Siposs ("Siposs"); rejected claims 1-5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,707,431 to Verkaart et al. ("Verkaart"); rejected claims 1-7, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by European patent application EP 1 084 722 A2; allowed claims 31-66; and objected to claims 9, 12, 13, 15, and 17-30 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten to include all limitations of the base claim and intervening claims.

By this Reply, Applicant has amended claims 1-6, 9-11, 13, and 15-66 and has canceled claims 7, 8, 12, and 14. No new matter is added by this Reply.

At the outset, Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's allowance of claims 31-66 and the indication that claims 9, 12, 13, 15, and 17-30 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten. Applicant submits that allowed claims 31-66 have been amended by this Reply to improve readability and to cure informalities.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that "the two journal articles and the Japanese reference listed on page 3 of the specification have not been considered." (Office Action at 2.) Applicant submits that the two journal articles listed on page 3 of the specification were submitted to the PTO in an Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement filed on August 21, 2008. Further, Applicant believes that the Japanese

reference listed on page 3 of the specification was incorrectly cited. Therefore, Applicants request that the Examiner indicates consideration of the two journal articles.

The Examiner objected to the drawings for “failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character ‘34’ has been used to designate both ‘solenoid valve’ and something in return branch 5 of fig. 6.” (Office Action at 2.) In this Reply, Applicant has provided a Replacement Sheet 3/3, which includes a replacement of Fig. 6. In this replacement sheet, reference number 34 on branch 5 below device 1 has been replaced with reference numeral 31. Accordingly, new reference numeral 31 now properly corresponds to the pressure sensor element located on branch 5. Applicant points out, however, that Replacement Sheet 3/3 contains two pressure sensor elements having reference numeral 31. As described in the specification, the pressure sensor element 31 may be positioned on line 11 next to solenoid 34, or may alternatively be positioned on branch 5 below device 1, as depicted by the dashed-line block on Replacement Sheet 3/3. Thus, based on this explanation and the revision to Fig. 6 discussed above, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the drawings.

The Examiner also objected to the specification “because of the following informalities: On page 13, line 24 ‘34’ should be ‘31’.” (Office Action at 2.) Applicant submits that this objection has been rendered moot by Applicant’s amendment of the specification by this Reply and requests that this objection be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s rejection of claims 1, 5-8, 10, 11, 14, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Siposs; the rejection of claims 1-5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Verkaart; and the

rejection of claims 1-7, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by EP 1 084 722 A2. While Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of these references, in order to expedite the prosecution of this application and the allowance of the pending claims, Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, and 16 to overcome these rejections. The amendments to the pending claims are discussed in more detail below to aid the Examiner's review of the amended claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of previously presented claims 7 and 12, which the Examiner indicated contains allowable subject matter. Accordingly, amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. Thus, amended claims 2-6, 10, 11, and 13 are allowable at least due to their dependence from allowable amended claim 1.

Claim 9, which the Examiner indicated contains allowable subject matter, has been amended to include the limitations of previously presented claims 1, 7, and 8. Accordingly, amended independent claim 9 is allowable over the cited references.

Claim 15, which the Examiner indicated contains allowable subject matter, has been amended to include the limitations of previously presented claims 1, 7, and 14. Accordingly, amended independent claim 15 is allowable over the cited references. Thus, amended claim 16 is allowable at least due to its dependence from allowable amended claim 16.

Claim 17, which the Examiner indicated contains allowable subject matter, has been amended to include the limitations of previously presented claim 1. Accordingly, amended independent claim 17 is allowable over the cited references. Thus, amended

claims 18-29 are allowable at least due to their dependence from allowable amended claim 17.

Claim 30, which the Examiner indicated contains allowable subject matter, has been amended to include the limitations of previously presented claim 1. Accordingly, amended independent claim 30 is allowable over the cited references.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections of claims 1, 5-8, 10, 11, 14, and 16. As outlined above, claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, and 16 have been amended to overcome these rejections (or now depend from a claim that has been amended to overcome these rejections). Claims 7, 8, and 14 have been canceled by this Reply. Applicant also respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the objections to claims 9, 13, 15, and 17-30 for at least the reasons discussed above.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 6, 2008

By: /Aaron L. Parker/  
Aaron L. Parker  
Reg. No. 50,785  
(202) 408-4000

**Attachment: Replacement Sheet 3/3 (Fig. 6)**